



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,663	12/19/2001	Steven A. Blaukenship	P-1106	6529
7590	04/28/2005		EXAMINER HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
Scott R. Cox Suite 2200 400 West Market St. Louisville, KY 40202			ART UNIT 1754	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,663

Applicant(s)

BLANKENSHIP ET AL.

Examiner

Stuart Hendrickson

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11, 13, 14 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 22-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. 5587348 taken with Wood et al.

This is the same rejection made in the previous action, incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 22-24, 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. 4484015 taken with Wood et al.

This is the same rejection made in the previous action, incorporated herein by reference.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over each of Brown et al. and Johnson et al. separately.

This is the same rejection made in the previous action, incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention.

This is the same rejection made in the previous action, incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/24/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments fail to recognize that the references do indeed teach reduction of the catalyst, and need not teach the claimed invention as a preferred embodiment. The argument of additional cost of present process steps is not persuasive, in view of the added value of them, which can be recouped. As Johnson teaches prereduction before use, it is not accepted that this 'teaches away' from the claimed invention. A logical reason has been advanced for combining the references, and the combination may be based upon what one of ordinary skill could reasonably expect to know- see In re Rouffet 47 USPQ 2d 1453. Concerning the on-sale arguments, a Declaration is awaited. Note that claim 14 does in fact recite the catalyst per se.

Art Unit: 1754

Arguments on pg. 11 are not accepted as they do not clearly state that the 'presently claimed process including the sale was not performed more than 1 year prior to the effective filing date of the present application'. The phrase used 'never produced ... catalysts produced ...' is awkward and unclear. *See MPEP 2133.03(c).*

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754